

10/032,431

- 2 -

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
AUG 03 2007REMARKS

As set forth in section 4 of the Office Action, "Claims 18-25 are rejected as being based upon a defective reissue oath/declaration under 35 U.S.C. 251." By section 3 of the Office Action, "[t]he reissue oath/declaration filed with this application is defective" for two reasons. First, the Office Action asserts that "[t]he supplemental reissue oath/declaration must be signed by the inventors." Additionally, the Office Action states that "[t]he supplemental reissue oath/declaration must indicated [sic] how to correct the error in Claim 25."

In response to the first reason proffered by the Office Action, a Supplemental Declaration for Continuation of Reissue Patent Application has been signed by all inventors and attached to this Reply. Therefore, the defect has been addressed and will not be discussed further.

Secondly, Claim 25 as filed depended from a canceled claim (Claim 7), and was amended in the December 10, 2002 Amendment to correctly depend from Claim 24. Support for Claim 25 as amended in December 2002 can be found at Column 6, lines 22-31, of the original patent. The undersigned has been unable to find in the rules or the MPEP a requirement that the Applicants state how an error has been corrected in the new claims. To the contrary, the MPEP states that "the corresponding corrective action which has been taken to correct the original patent need not be identified in the oath or declaration." MPEP § 1414 (Rev. 5, Aug. 2006), page 1400-33, left column, fourth full paragraph. However, in light of the Office Action's request, Applicants have included such language in the attached Supplemental Declaration for Continuation of Reissue Patent Application. As such, the defect has been addressed and will not be discussed further.

10/032,431

- 3 -

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER


AUG 03 2007

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By 
James M. Smith
Registration No. 28,043
Telephone: (978) 341-0036
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Date: 8/3/07